

CONGRESS.

Abstract of the More Important Proceedings of Both Houses.

TUESDAY, FEB. 6.

In the Senate, Senator Hawley said that the moment the Democratic party secured National control it had been evident that the repeal of the Federal election laws would be one of the first tasks which it would undertake. Except on the emergency bill, relating to the repeal of the Sherman silver-purchasing act, this bill was the first distinctive party measure of the Democratic party. There were, he said, no statute books certain states intended not to make voters, but to secure to voters the rights guaranteed to them by the United States Government. It was now proposed to repeal all of them with the sole exception of the one providing for the election of United States Senators.

"These election laws, Mr. Hawley said, were not made merely for the Southern States. While nullification of the right of suffrage was, in some sense, triumphant in the South, it was progressing in the North, and the Federal election laws were just such needed in certain sections of the North as they had ever been needed in the South.

He recalled the declaration of a Southern man in the anti-bellum era that the best condition of a country was where capital, "owned labor." And that idea, he said, was at the bottom of the Wilson tariff bill. It was that the best condition of the country was one where labor was cheap and abundant.

Mr. Perkins (Cal.) said that it seemed to him that those who had spoken in favor of the passage of the pending bill had done so from a feeling of partisan prejudice. They had done so not influenced by any motive of the public good. He had waited patiently for some reason to be given why the Federal election laws should be repealed. He had waited to hear that they had done so for the sake of the right of fairly casting his vote and of having that vote honestly counted. He had been waiting to hear that they were un-American, and that they were calculated to subvert the rights of American citizens. But up to this time, only two reasons had been given that had impressed his mind. One of those reasons was that given by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Palmer), that the laws had not been enforced; and the other was that they had been passed by the Republican party for the purpose of perpetrating evil in office. Certainly the last proposition fell, without an answer.

Mr. Daniel favored the repeal of the Federal election laws because they were useless, were very expensive, and had a "tendency to sectional friction, sectional irritation and sectional antagonism."

Mr. Frye declared that the claim had been made that the Federal election laws ought to be repealed because the States could be trusted to prevent election frauds. He was asked by Mr. Daniel if there never had been election frauds in Maine, and he denied that there had been, although there had been an attempt by a Democratic Governor to prevent the election.

Mr. Harris spoke in favor of repeal, and Mr. Daniel and Mr. Frye indulged in a free-and-easy colloquy on the subject, at the close of which the Senate adjourned.

In the House the Hawaiian debate during the day was interesting, but not exciting. Mr. Outwater eulogized President Cleveland and asserted that Minister Stevens was in league with the sugar planters. He was asked by Mr. Outwater a strong question in support of the repeal of the McKinley resolution; Mr. Storor (Ohio) argued that the appointment of Mr. Blount was illegal, and reviewed all the cases that had been quoted as precedents to show that they were in no way analogous to this, while of the deception practiced by the Administration toward President Dole he said: "You may take either side of the question and say that Mr. Williams knew that he could not use force, and then he was acting a bullying lie, or you can say that he did not know it (as he says he did not), and then the Administration was acting a bullying lie."

Mr. Lord (Cal.) said that he had gone to Hawaii with Mr. Blount, but upon arriving there they had parted company—Mr. Blount to make a star chamber of the Hawaiian Islands and go upon the highways and byways seeking light in the broad day. He criticized Mr. Blount severely, and exclaimed with great emphasis: "No single man should be allowed to determine the fate of a Nation. It is unjust to the man, it is a crime against the Nation."

Gen. Sikes, the veteran Democrat of New York, created a sensation by attacking the President's policy. He was the first Democrat who had not upheld the resolution of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He held that one Administration should not constitute itself a continuation of the first or review of a preceding Administration.

The first vote was taken upon Mr. Blount's amendment declaring in favor of annexation. This was defeated by a vote of 90 Republicans to 155 Democrats.

After the defeat of Mr. Blount's substitute, the question recurred on the original resolution offered by Mr. McKinley. This declares the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to be a national policy in employing the Navy for aid in overthrowing the Queen and setting up a Provisional Government not Republican in form and in opposition to the majority, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution, and is condemned. Also that the House approves the principle announced by the President, that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions. Further, that annexation of Hawaii or a protectorate is unequal for and inexpedient, and that the people of Hawaii should have freedom to pursue their own line of policy, and that foreign intervention will not be regarded by us with indifference.

The vote disclosed lack of a quorum. Mr. McCreary had a restraining order, looking all leaves of absence, and directing the Sergeant-at-Arms to notify the absentees that they must attend the sessions, in order that public business be not delayed. The House then adjourned.

On Wednesday, Feb. 7.

In the Senate, Mr. Hoar opposed the repeal bill.

"Wherever there is a crevice in our protection of the freedom of the ballot," said he, "there you will find the Democratic party trying to break through. Wherever we have left open an opportunity to get possession of an office contrary to the true constitutional will of the majority, there you will find that party pressing and exercising an ingenuity before which even the inventive genius of the American people exerts in other directions fails, and is insignificant in comparison."

Senator Gray claimed that the election laws had in every instance promoted and aggravated fraud instead of preventing them. The Democratic party believed these laws at war with every tradition of local self-government. Not only did they degrade the States and the citizens, but they buttressed up the very fraud they were designed to suppress.

Mr. Northway.

He introduced the Government under the silver-purchase act of July 14, 1890. As bullion will coin more dollars than it costs, there is a gain going on constantly while silver is being coined.

Some men asserted that there could be no seigniorage until the whole amount of the bullion was coined, but neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor Mr. (Blount) held this view.

The bill provided for the issuance of silver certificates and silver notes on the seigniorage of the remaining silver bullion in the Treasury, and that when these were redeemed by silver dollars so coined they shall not be re-issued.

The bill was to be coined only for the redemption of the certificates and notes. The proposed bill was not for the purpose of redeeming the notes issued under the Sherman law, nor would it interfere with the redemption of those notes. He thought all the silver bullion in the Treasury should be coined, and as soon as the certificates issued on them had been redeemed they should not be re-issued; when the silver dollar was once paid out that ought to be the last of them.

The House adjourned at 4:00 o'clock.

FRIDAY, FEB. 9.

In the House, after the call of committees for reports had been concluded, Mr. Blount was recognized to conclude his remarks in support

of his measure, and said, by way of preface, that he was reporting in the papers as being willing to strike out the coinage of the bullion in the Treasury purchased under the Sherman law and remaining until coined. That statement was not true, he said, and he was not willing to strike out the coinage of the bullion in the Treasury purchased under the Sherman law and remaining until coined. That statement was not true, he said, and he was not willing to strike out the coinage of the bullion in the Treasury purchased under the Sherman law and remaining until coined.

The year and days being demanded on Mr. Chandler's amendment, it was defeated by a vote of 27 to 167; Senator Stewart (Nev. R.) and Senators Allen, Kyle, and Peffer (Kan. P.) voting with the Democrats.

Senator Chandler then presented an amendment, the effect of which was to apply the repeal section of the bill to Supervisors and Deputy Marshals, but to leave on the statute books the "crimes section."

"I hope this amendment will be satisfactory to the other side," said Senator Chandler. "By it the various sections of the existing law providing for Marshals and Supervisors will be repealed. But we shall still have the crimes act, and crimes against the suffrages in connection with Congressional elections will still be punishable under United States statutes and in United States Courts."

But the Democrats evidently do not approve of punishing crimes against the ballot; for this amendment, too, was defeated, the vote being 27 to 167.

These election laws, Mr. Hawley said, were not made merely for the Southern States. While nullification of the right of suffrage was, in some sense, triumphant in the South, it was progressing in the North, and the Federal election laws were just such needed in certain sections of the North as they had ever been needed in the South.

He recalled the declaration of a Southern man in the anti-bellum era that the best condition of a country was where capital, "owned labor." And that idea, he said, was at the bottom of the Wilson tariff bill. It was that the best condition of the country was one where labor was cheap and abundant.

Mr. Perkins (Cal.) said that it seemed to him that those who had spoken in favor of the passage of the pending bill had done so from a feeling of partisan prejudice. They had done so not influenced by any motive of the public good. He had waited patiently for some reason to be given why the Federal election laws should be repealed. He had waited to hear that they had done so for the sake of the right of fairly casting his vote and of having that vote honestly counted. He had been waiting to hear that they were un-American, and that they were calculated to subvert the rights of American citizens. But up to this time, only two reasons had been given that had impressed his mind. One of those reasons was that given by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Palmer), that the laws had not been enforced; and the other was that they had been passed by the Republican party for the purpose of perpetrating evil in office. Certainly the last proposition fell, without an answer.

Mr. Daniel favored the repeal of the Federal election laws because they were useless, were very expensive, and had a "tendency to sectional friction, sectional irritation and sectional antagonism."

Mr. Frye declared that the claim had been made that the Federal election laws ought to be repealed because the States could be trusted to prevent election frauds. He was asked by Mr. Daniel if there never had been election frauds in Maine, and he denied that there had been, although there had been an attempt by a Democratic Governor to prevent the election.

Mr. Harris spoke in favor of repeal, and Mr. Daniel and Mr. Frye indulged in a free-and-easy colloquy on the subject, at the close of which the Senate adjourned.

In the House the Hawaiian debate during the day was interesting, but not exciting. Mr. Outwater eulogized President Cleveland and asserted that Minister Stevens was in league with the sugar planters. He was asked by Mr. Outwater a strong question in support of the repeal of the McKinley resolution; Mr. Storor (Ohio) argued that the appointment of Mr. Blount was illegal, and reviewed all the cases that had been quoted as precedents to show that they were in no way analogous to this, while of the deception practiced by the Administration toward President Dole he said: "You may take either side of the question and say that Mr. Williams knew that he could not use force, and then he was acting a bullying lie, or you can say that he did not know it (as he says he did not), and then the Administration was acting a bullying lie."

Mr. Lord (Cal.) said that he had gone to Hawaii with Mr. Blount, but upon arriving there they had parted company—Mr. Blount to make a star chamber of the Hawaiian Islands and go upon the highways and byways seeking light in the broad day. He criticized Mr. Blount severely, and exclaimed with great emphasis: "No single man should be allowed to determine the fate of a Nation. It is unjust to the man, it is a crime against the Nation."

Gen. Sikes, the veteran Democrat of New York, created a sensation by attacking the President's policy. He was the first Democrat who had not upheld the resolution of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He held that one Administration should not constitute itself a continuation of the first or review of a preceding Administration.

The first vote was taken upon Mr. Blount's amendment declaring in favor of annexation. This was defeated by a vote of 90 Republicans to 155 Democrats.

After the defeat of Mr. Blount's substitute, the question recurred on the original resolution offered by Mr. McKinley. This declares the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to be a national policy in employing the Navy for aid in overthrowing the Queen and setting up a Provisional Government not Republican in form and in opposition to the majority, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution, and is condemned. Also that the House approves the principle announced by the President, that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions. Further, that annexation of Hawaii or a protectorate is unequal for and inexpedient, and that the people of Hawaii should have freedom to pursue their own line of policy, and that foreign intervention will not be regarded by us with indifference.

The vote disclosed lack of a quorum. Mr. McCreary had a restraining order, looking all leaves of absence, and directing the Sergeant-at-Arms to notify the absentees that they must attend the sessions, in order that public business be not delayed. The House then adjourned.

On Wednesday, Feb. 7.

In the Senate, Mr. Hoar opposed the repeal bill.

"Wherever there is a crevice in our protection of the freedom of the ballot," said he, "there you will find the Democratic party trying to break through. Wherever we have left open an opportunity to get possession of an office contrary to the true constitutional will of the majority, there you will find that party pressing and exercising an ingenuity before which even the inventive genius of the American people exerts in other directions fails, and is insignificant in comparison."

Senator Gray claimed that the election laws had in every instance promoted and aggravated fraud instead of preventing them. The Democratic party believed these laws at war with every tradition of local self-government. Not only did they degrade the States and the citizens, but they buttressed up the very fraud they were designed to suppress.

Mr. Northway.

He introduced the Government under the silver-purchase act of July 14, 1890. As bullion will coin more dollars than it costs, there is a gain going on constantly while silver is being coined.

Some men asserted that there could be no seigniorage until the whole amount of the bullion was coined, but neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor Mr. (Blount) held this view.

The bill provided for the issuance of silver certificates and silver notes on the seigniorage of the remaining silver bullion in the Treasury, and that when these were redeemed by silver dollars so coined they shall not be re-issued.

The bill was to be coined only for the redemption of the certificates and notes. The proposed bill was not for the purpose of redeeming the notes issued under the Sherman law, nor would it interfere with the redemption of those notes. He thought all the silver bullion in the Treasury should be coined, and as soon as the certificates issued on them had been redeemed they should not be re-issued; when the silver dollar was once paid out that ought to be the last of them.

The House adjourned at 4:00 o'clock.

FRIDAY, FEB. 9.

In the House, after the call of committees for reports had been concluded, Mr. Blount was recognized to conclude his remarks in support

of his measure, and said, by way of preface, that he was reporting in the papers as being willing to strike out the coinage of the bullion in the Treasury purchased under the Sherman law and remaining until coined. That statement was not true, he said, and he was not willing to strike out the coinage of the bullion in the Treasury purchased under the Sherman law and remaining until coined.

The year and days being demanded on Mr. Chandler's amendment, it was defeated by a vote of 27 to 167; Senator Stewart (Nev. R.) and Senators Allen, Kyle, and Peffer (Kan. P.) voting with the Democrats.

Senator Chandler then presented an amendment, the effect of which was to apply the repeal section of the bill to Supervisors and Deputy Marshals, but to leave on the statute books the "crimes section."

"I hope this amendment will be satisfactory to the other side," said Senator Chandler. "By it the various sections of the existing law providing for Marshals and Supervisors will be repealed. But we shall still have the crimes act, and crimes against the suffrages in connection with Congressional elections will still be punishable under United States statutes and in United States Courts."

But the Democrats evidently do not approve of punishing crimes against the ballot; for this amendment, too, was defeated, the vote being 27 to 167.

These election laws, Mr. Hawley said, were not made merely for the Southern States. While nullification of the right of suffrage was, in some sense, triumphant in the South, it was progressing in the North, and the Federal election laws were just such needed in certain sections of the North as they had ever been needed in the South.

He recalled the declaration of a Southern man in the anti-bellum era that the best condition of a country was where capital, "owned labor." And that idea, he said, was at the bottom of the Wilson tariff bill. It was that the best condition of the country was one where labor was cheap and abundant.

Mr. Perkins (Cal.) said that it seemed to him that those who had spoken in favor of the passage of the pending bill had done so from a feeling of partisan prejudice. They had done so not influenced by any motive of the public good. He had waited patiently for some reason to be given why the Federal election laws should be repealed. He had waited to hear that they had done so for the sake of the right of fairly casting his vote and of having that vote honestly counted. He had been waiting to hear that they were un-American, and that they were calculated to subvert the rights of American citizens. But up to this time, only two reasons had been given that had impressed his mind. One of those reasons was that given by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Palmer), that the laws had not been enforced; and the other was that they had been passed by the Republican party for the purpose of perpetrating evil in office. Certainly the last proposition fell, without an answer.

Mr. Daniel favored the repeal of the Federal election laws because they were useless, were very expensive, and had a "tendency to sectional friction, sectional irritation and sectional antagonism."

Mr. Frye declared that the claim had been made that the Federal election laws ought to be repealed because the States could be trusted to prevent election frauds. He was asked by Mr. Daniel if there never had been election frauds in Maine, and he denied that there had been, although there had been an attempt by a Democratic Governor to prevent the election.

Mr. Harris spoke in favor of repeal, and Mr. Daniel and Mr. Frye indulged in a free-and-easy colloquy on the subject, at the close of which the Senate adjourned.

In the House the Hawaiian debate during the day was interesting, but not exciting. Mr. Outwater eulogized President Cleveland and asserted that Minister Stevens was in league with the sugar planters. He was asked by Mr. Outwater a strong question in support of the repeal of the McKinley resolution; Mr. Storor (Ohio) argued that the appointment of Mr. Blount was illegal, and reviewed all the cases that had been quoted as precedents to show that they were in no way analogous to this, while of the deception practiced by the Administration toward President Dole he said: "You may take either side of the question and say that Mr. Williams knew that he could not use force, and then he was acting a bullying lie, or you can say that he did not know it (as he says he did not), and then the Administration was acting a bullying lie."

Mr. Lord (Cal.) said that he had gone to Hawaii with Mr. Blount, but upon arriving there they had parted company—Mr. Blount to make a star chamber of the Hawaiian Islands and go upon the highways and byways seeking light in the broad day. He criticized Mr. Blount severely, and exclaimed with great emphasis: "No single man should be allowed to determine the fate of a Nation. It is unjust to the man, it is a crime against the Nation."

Gen. Sikes, the veteran Democrat of New York, created a sensation by attacking the President's policy. He was the first Democrat who had not upheld the resolution of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He held that one Administration should not constitute itself a continuation of the first or review of a preceding Administration.

The first vote was taken upon Mr. Blount's amendment declaring in favor of annexation. This was defeated by a vote of 90 Republicans to 155 Democrats.

After the defeat of Mr. Blount's substitute, the question recurred on the original resolution offered by Mr. McKinley. This declares the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to be a national policy in employing the Navy for aid in overthrowing the Queen and setting up a Provisional Government not Republican in form and in opposition to the majority, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution, and is condemned. Also that the House approves the principle announced by the President, that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions. Further, that annexation of Hawaii or a protectorate is unequal for and inexpedient, and that the people of Hawaii should have freedom to pursue their own line of policy, and that foreign intervention will not be regarded by us with indifference.

The vote disclosed lack of a quorum. Mr. McCreary had a restraining order, looking all leaves of absence, and directing the Sergeant-at-Arms to notify the absentees that they must attend the sessions, in order that public business be not delayed. The House then adjourned.

On Wednesday, Feb. 7.

In the Senate, Mr. Hoar opposed the repeal bill.

"Wherever there is a crevice in our protection of the freedom of the ballot," said he, "there you will find the Democratic party trying to break through. Wherever we have left open an opportunity to get possession of an office contrary to the true constitutional will of the majority, there you will find that party pressing and exercising an ingenuity before which even the inventive genius of the American people exerts in other directions fails, and is insignificant in comparison."

Senator Gray claimed that the election laws had in every instance promoted and aggravated fraud instead of preventing them. The Democratic party believed these laws at war with every tradition of local self-government. Not only did they degrade the States and the citizens, but they buttressed up the very fraud they were designed to suppress.

Mr. Northway.

He introduced the Government under the silver-purchase act of July 14, 1890. As bullion will coin more dollars than it costs, there is a gain going on constantly while silver is being coined.

Some men asserted that there could be no seigniorage until the whole amount of the bullion was coined, but neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor Mr. (Blount) held this view.

The bill provided for the issuance of silver certificates and silver notes on the seigniorage of the remaining silver bullion in the Treasury, and that when these were redeemed by silver dollars so coined they shall not be re-issued.

The bill was to be coined only for the redemption of the certificates and notes. The proposed bill was not for the purpose of redeeming the notes issued under the Sherman law, nor would it interfere with the redemption of those notes. He thought all the silver bullion in the Treasury should be coined, and as soon as the certificates issued on them had been redeemed they should not be re-issued; when the silver dollar was once paid out that ought to be the last of them.

The House adjourned at 4:00 o'clock.

FRIDAY, FEB. 9.

In the House, after the call of committees for reports had been concluded, Mr. Blount was recognized to conclude his remarks in support

"SUSPENDED."

Some Who Have Lost Their Dues by Action of the Pension Bureau.

Joseph Mack, of Altona, Pa., is another victim of the new pension ruling. He is totally blind and has been blind since childhood. He entered Co. F, 133d Regt., and after an honorable discharge re-enlisted in the 6th Pa. Cav. On account of injuries and privations, he has never been able to do an actual day's work. His eyes began to fail him at once. He is now, and has been since December, 1891, totally blind. The history of Mr. Mack's pension case from the beginning of November up to the present date is as follows:

Just about the 8th day of November, the day on which, it is since proved, his pension was suspended, he received from the Pension Department a notice to the effect that his pension was suspended until he had been examined by the following: "If you do not send additional medical testimony to prove that your condition is such as is set forth in your former application, the same testimony to be sent in within 60 days from this date, your pension will be cut down one-half."

Mr. Mack counted up the time as to when the 60 days would expire, and found that Jan. 8 would be the date. If Mr. Mack's calculations were correct, this would make the date of the notice Nov. 9, one day after his suspension! It was, however, cut off entirely, without word of warning, on Nov. 8. Mr. Mack noticed notice to that effect on Jan. 23, 1894.

William K. Johnson, of Princeton, Mo., is a decrepit old man, being near 70 years of age. He served during the war as a member of Co. 10th Mo., and also of Co. E, 4th Veteran Reserve Corps, and has been on the pension-roll for a long time, his pension dating back to the time of his discharge. He was drawing \$12 per month until he received a recent letter from the Pension Bureau, telling him he was able to work.

Henry M. Dexter, Wayne, Mo., served in the 11th Me. His record, both military and civil, is well known to most of the people of Wayne, and is above reproach in general. He remained in service until the close of the war, and was a faithful soldier. He was only in the hospital during the whole term of service one day, and was mustered out of the service on Nov. 1, 1864. "By reason of the close of the war," Mr. Dexter is 56 years of age, and has been drawing a pension of \$6 per month for a little over a year. A few years ago he was terribly injured by a fall from a bridge, and though disabled and unable to work, he has been relieved of his pension.

Conrad D. Montague, Portland, Ore., says he is a victim of the pension rule. He has been jerked away as if it had astringed tied to it, and he thinks it would be a "roaring" if it was not a matter of such terrible earnestness during the prevailing stringency.

The friends of the pension rule, Mr. Montague says, are indignant over the "real justice" shown him by the present Administration. He served in Co. 1, 15th Conn., and has been disabled for a long time. He was drawing \$12 per month, was raised to \$14, and when he became totally helpless received \$50 a month. Last May he received notice that his pension was suspended, and reliable certificates were forwarded to Washington from reputable physicians, but were of no avail. The pension was last month, worrying to the last about the matter, and leaving his faithful wife in great need.

The late Conrad Edwards Buckley, of Hockley Falls, N. Y., was for months before his death bedridden and totally helpless, and while in this condition his friends sent in an application for a pension. He received \$10 a month, and his condition improved. He was then given a pension of \$12 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$14 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$16 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$18 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$20 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$22 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$24 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$26 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$28 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$30 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$32 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$34 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$36 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$38 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$40 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$42 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$44 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$46 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$48 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$50 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$52 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$54 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$56 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$58 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$60 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$62 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$64 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$66 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$68 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$70 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$72 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$74 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$76 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$78 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$80 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$82 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$84 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$86 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$88 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$90 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$92 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$94 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$96 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$98 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$100 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$102 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$104 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$106 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$108 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$110 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$112 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$114 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$116 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$118 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$120 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$122 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$124 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$126 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$128 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$130 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$132 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$134 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$136 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$138 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$140 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$142 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$144 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$146 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$148 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$150 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$152 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$154 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$156 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$158 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$160 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$162 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$164 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$166 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$168 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$170 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$172 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$174 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$176 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$178 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$180 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$182 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$184 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$186 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$188 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$190 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$192 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$194 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$196 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$198 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$200 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$202 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$204 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$206 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$208 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$210 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$212 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$214 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$216 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$218 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$220 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$222 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$224 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$226 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$228 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$230 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$232 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$234 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$236 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$238 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$240 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$242 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$244 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$246 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$248 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$250 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$252 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$254 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$256 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$258 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$260 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$262 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$264 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$266 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$268 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$270 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$272 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$274 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$276 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$278 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$280 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$282 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$284 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$286 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$288 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$290 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$292 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$294 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$296 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$298 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$300 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$302 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$304 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$306 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$308 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$310 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$312 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$314 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$316 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$318 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$320 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$322 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$324 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$326 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$328 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$330 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$332 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$334 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$336 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$338 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$340 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$342 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$344 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$346 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$348 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$350 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$352 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$354 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$356 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$358 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$360 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$362 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$364 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$366 a month, and he was then given a pension of \$